

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, Applicants amended independent claims 1 and 9 to clarify that the second clock signal has a frequency that is a multiple of a frequency of the first clock signal, and respectfully traverse the rejection based on this amendment.

The Examiner asserts that the factor  $n$  by which the frequency of the first clock is multiplied to obtain the frequency of the second clock signal is not defined properly. Accordingly, Applicants have clarified the claim language as discussed above.

Applicants' specification teaches that a FIR filter 801 performs interpolation with an interpolation factor  $n$ . Support for this statement can be found in Applicants' specification on page 13, lines 27-29, which teach "an interpolation factor  $n$  for interpolation and the interpolation FIR filter 801 is set to 10 ( $n=10$ ).". Page 14, lines 1-2 of Applicants' specification disclose that a sampled signal is multiplied by interpolation. More specifically, the sampled digital signal 810 is subject to two tenfold interpolation by an interpolation FIR filter 801.

In FIG. 11, the circles indicate the sampled values of the Nyquist waveform in the case of sampling the Nyquist waveform based on a clock signal whose frequency is four times the frequency of a synchronization signal. The tap coefficients of a first FIR filter are formed by extracting every fourth sampled value of the Nyquist waveform (See

pg. 15, lns. 13-19 of Applicants' specification). For these reasons, withdrawal of the §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being non-enabling. In response, Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-17.

As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 9 now clarify that the second clock signal has a frequency a multiple of a frequency of the first clock signal. Support for the amendment can be found in Applicants' specification on page 13, lines 27-29; page 14, lines 1-3; page 15, lines 13-19; and FIG. 11 of the present application. For these reasons, withdrawal of the §112, first paragraph rejection of claims 1-17 as being non-enabling is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

  
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760

August 6, 2007  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978